

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, the drawings and claims 1-6 have been amended. Claims 1-6 are pending and under consideration.

OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

Figure 7 was objected for failing to include a legend such as "Prior Art." Appropriate correction has been made to Figure 7.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

AMENDMENTS TO DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATION

In addition to the change to Figure 7, Figures 1, 4 and 5 all contain two reference numerals "13." In both the specification and drawings, the reference numerals "13" designating bolts have been changed to "16." The reference numeral "13" designating the sensor signal receiving section has not been changed.

CLAIM OBJECTION

Claim 1 was objected to for an informality. Appropriate correction has been made to claim 1 to correct the grammar in the clause of claim 1 reciting the electric power receiving section.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable for obviousness over the admitted prior art (hereinafter "APA") in view of Breed (US 2003/0009270) (hereinafter "Breed").

Amended claim 1 recites: "...an outer member having an inner periphery formed with a plurality of raceways and adapted to be secured to the vehicle body structure through a knuckle, on which an inboard end of the outer periphery of the outer member is attached... an electric power receiving section to receive wirelessly an electric operating power for the sensor section and the sensor signal transmitting section, wherein the knuckle is provided with at least an antenna in one or both of the sensor signal transmitting section and the electric power receiving section."

The Office Action notes that the APA does not show these features of claim 1 and instead relies on Breed to show the electric power receiving section. It is respectfully submitted that although Breed does discuss wireless sensors the Office Action only notes that it is conventional to use an antenna as a source of RF power without citing a prior art reference. Further, the Office Action notes that locating the antenna on the knuckle is obvious since this is a stable point without citing a prior art reference.

The Examiner's finding of obviousness without citing prior art references is respectfully traversed. Referring to MPEP 2144.03, if the Applicants challenge a factual assertion as not properly officially noticed or not properly based upon common knowledge, the Examiner must support the finding with adequate evidence. The Applicants traversal is based on that the present invention provides a wireless sensor incorporated wheel support bearing assembly, in which the freedom or flexibility of space for positioning communication component parts can be increased so that the highly efficient wireless supply of the electric power or highly efficient transmission and reception of the sensor signal can be achieved. These advantages are not shown in the relied upon prior art, specifically the APA and Breed.

In further support of these arguments, please note that claim 1 has been amended to limit the location of the knuckle, on which the antenna is located, so that the location of the antenna is now more clearly defined. In its currently amended form, it is even clearer that Breed is silent about a wheel support bearing assembly in which it is possible to avoid reduction in efficiency resulting from the presence of an interfering obstacle.

Claims 2-6 depend on claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons. Further, claims 2-6 recite features that patentably distinguish over the relied upon references, taken alone or in combination. For example, claim 2 recites that one or both of the sensor signal transmitting section and the electric power receiving section are, in their substantial entirety, arranged in the knuckle. To reject this feature of claim 2, the Office Action notes that the locating the sensor signal transmitting section and the electric power receiving section in the knuckle is obvious without supporting this assertion with evidence. This finding of obviousness is respectfully traversed and it is respectfully requested that documentary evidence be provided if this claim is not allowed. Regarding claims 3-6, it is also respectfully requested that documentary evidence be provided if these claims are not found to be allowable.

Additionally, claims 2-6 have been amended to improve the form of the claims. No new matter has been added.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 10, 2008

By: Gregory W. Harper
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

ATTACHMENT TO THE AMENDMENT
SERIAL NO. 10/573,256
DUE: March 11, 2008